



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,251	09/25/2001	Gina E. Kelly	ATL 271	8579
28159	7590	04/09/2009	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			NAJARIAN, LENA	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001			3686	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/09/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte GINA E. KELLY and DAVID R. LEVESQUE

Appeal 2008-4996
Application 09/963,251
Technology Center 3600

Decided: ¹April 9, 2009

Before ANTON W. FETTING, DAVID B. WALKER, and
BIBHU R. MOHANTY. *Administrative Patent Judges.*

FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Gina E. Kelly and David B. Levesque (Appellants) seek review under

¹ The two month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304, begins to run from the date shown on this page of the decision. The time period does not run from the Mail Date (paper delivery) or Notification Date (electronic delivery).

Appeal 2008-4996
Application 09/963,251

1 35 U.S.C. § 134 of a non-final rejection of claims 1-23, the only claims pending in
2 the application on appeal.

3 We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

4
5 **We AFFIRM.**

6 The Appellants invented a way of presenting training materials in a format
7 which closely simulates the medical records which a medical professional uses in
8 daily practice while providing educational instruction and information not usually
9 found in conventional medical records. In a diagnostic medical imaging
10 embodiment the student is presented with information on the full spectrum of
11 diagnostic imaging modalities which may be applied to a given pathology.
12 (Specification 2:10-23).

13 An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary
14 claim 1, which is reproduced below [bracketed matter and some paragraphing
15 added].

16 1. A computer-based interactive medical training system comprising
17 [1] a case study
18 [2] presented in a computerized display
19 [3] in a virtual patient chart format
20 [4] for a patient exhibiting a given medical condition,
21 [5] wherein the virtual patient chart format simulates realistic aspects
22 of a patient chart of medical records.

23
24 This appeal arises from the Examiner's Non-Final Rejection, mailed May 18,
25 2007. The Appellants filed an Appeal Brief in support of the appeal on October 9,

1 2007.

2 An Examiner's Answer to the Appeal Brief was mailed on November 28, 2007.

3 **PRIOR ART**

4 The Examiner relies upon the following prior art:

Eckmann	US 4,539,435	Sep. 3, 1985
Garcia	US 5,065,315	Nov. 12, 1991
Ramshaw	US 5,791,907	Aug. 11, 1998
Gray	US 6,149,585	Nov. 21, 2000
Allison	US 6,546,230 B1	Apr. 8, 2003

5 **REJECTIONS**

6 Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-
7 statutory subject matter.

8 Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing
9 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

10 Claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as
11 unpatentable over Allison and Eckmann.

12 Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison,
13 Eckmann, and Gray.

14 Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison,
15 Eckmann, and Garcia.

16 Claims 13-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over
17 Allison, Eckmann, and Ramshaw.

ISSUES

The issues pertinent to this appeal are

- Whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.
 - This issue turns on whether the claims describe more than mere non-functional descriptive material under display.
 - Whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.
 - This issue turns on whether the claims definitely set forth the invention.
 - Whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison and Eckmann.
 - This issue turns on whether the art describes a patient case history presented as a patient chart.
 - Whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison, Eckmann, and Gray.
 - Whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison, Eckmann, and Garcia.

- Whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 13-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison, Eckmann, and Ramshaw.

FACTS PERTINENT TO THE ISSUES

The following enumerated Findings of Fact (FF) are believed to be supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

Facts Related to Claim Construction

01. The patient chart is a medical record file familiar to most medical professionals (Specification 4:25-26).

Eckman

02. Eckman is directed to an automated educational testing system in which students at remote locations are able to use a standard push-button Touch-Tone-type telephone and ordinary telephone lines to interact with an automated educational and testing center (Eckman 2:54-58).

03. Eckman describes an example in which the student is a physician. A publication is generated at regular intervals that might include an article on a novel approach to dealing with a certain medical problem. The publication might also include a case study of a situation to which test questions might be directed (Eckman 4:42-49).

04. Eckman describes how, for each simulated patient management problem, the publication would include a brief patient history and a list of choices for each question (Eckman 5:61-65).

05. Eckman describes an exemplary patient history as follows.

1 A 50-year-old white male presents with three weeks of episodic
2 fatigue and exertional dyspnea. Symptoms have occurred at
3 least once daily, and episodes have lasted from a few minutes to
4 about one hour. With the longer attacks, he notes a decreased
5 ability to concentrate on his work. There have been no other
6 associated symptoms.

7 The past history is notable only for peptic ulcer disease at age
8 21, with no recurrence, but with occasional acid indigestion.
9 He smokes one pack per day, and has about four ounces of
10 alcohol daily. His family history is unremarkable.

11 Eckman 6:1-14.

12 *Allison*

13 06. Allison is directed to an online, interactive method for training and
14 testing health care professionals at remote sites. Competency tests and
15 training courses are stored at a central training facility and are accessed
16 from a remote diagnostic system. Diagnostic systems may include
17 different imaging modalities, such as computed tomography (CT),
18 magnetic resonance (MR), nuclear medicine (NM), ultrasound, and x-ray
19 (both conventional film and digital or digitized imaging) (Allison 2:2-
20 32).

21 *Facts Related To The Level Of Skill In The Art*

22 07. Neither the Examiner nor the Appellants have addressed the level of
23 ordinary skill in the pertinent arts of systems analysis and programming,
24 medical simulation systems, medical training, and user interface design.
25 We will therefore consider the cited prior art as representative of the
26 level of ordinary skill in the art. *See Okajima v. Bourdeau*, 261 F.3d
27 1350, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2001) ("[T]he absence of specific findings on the
28 level of skill in the art does not give rise to reversible error 'where the

1 prior art itself reflects an appropriate level and a need for testimony is
2 not shown'') (quoting *Litton Indus. Prods., Inc. v. Solid State Sys. Corp.*,
3 755 F.2d 158, 163 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

4 *Facts Related To Secondary Considerations*

5 08. There is no evidence on record of secondary considerations of non-
6 obviousness for our consideration.

7 PRINCIPLES OF LAW

8 *Claim Construction*

9 During examination of a patent application, pending claims are given
10 their broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification. *In*
11 *re Prater* , 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05 (CCPA 1969); *In re Am. Acad. of Sci.*
12 *Tech Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

13 Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not
14 read into the claim. *E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp.*, 343 F.3d 1364, 1369 (Fed.
15 Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted "in view of the specification" without
16 importing limitations from the specification into the claims unnecessarily).

17 Although a patent applicant is entitled to be his or her own lexicographer of
18 patent claim terms, in *ex parte* prosecution it must be within limits. *In re Corr*,
19 347 F.2d 578, 580 (CCPA 1965). The applicant must do so by placing such
20 definitions in the specification with sufficient clarity to provide a person of
21 ordinary skill in the art with clear and precise notice of the meaning that is to be
22 construed. *See also In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1480 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (although
23 an inventor is free to define the specific terms used to describe the invention, this
24 must be done with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision; where an

1 inventor chooses to give terms uncommon meanings, the inventor must set out any
2 uncommon definition in some manner within the patent disclosure so as to give
3 one of ordinary skill in the art notice of the change).

4 *Claim Preamble*

5 "A claim preamble has the import that the claim as a whole suggests for it."
6 *Bell Communications Research, Inc. v. Vitalink Communications Corp.*, 55 F.3d
7 615, 620 (Fed. Cir. 1995). Where a patentee uses the claim preamble to recite
8 structural limitations of his claimed invention, the PTO and courts give effect to
9 that usage. *See id.; Corning Glass Works v. Sumitomo Elec. U.S.A., Inc.*, 868 F.2d
10 1251, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Conversely, where a patentee defines a structurally
11 complete invention in the claim body and uses the preamble only to state a purpose
12 or intended use for the invention, the preamble is not a claim limitation. *See Bell*
13 *Communications*, 55 F.3d at 620; *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152 (CCPA
14 1951).

15 *Statutory Subject Matter*

16 [Whether a] patent is invalid for failure to claim statutory subject
17 matter under § 101, is a matter of both claim construction and
18 statutory construction.
19 *State St. Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Fin. Group*, 149 F.3d 1368, 1370 (Fed. Cir.
20 1998).

21 Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine,
22 manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful
23 improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
24 conditions and requirements of this title.

25 35 U.S.C. § 101.

26 Our reviewing court further interpreted this as follows:

27 The Supreme Court has interpreted this statutory range of patentable

1 subject matter to be quite broad, but hardly universal. "In choosing
2 such expansive terms as 'manufacture' and 'composition of matter,'
3 modified by the comprehensive 'any,' Congress plainly contemplated
4 that the patent laws would be given wide scope." *Diamond v.*
5 *Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. 303, 308 (1980). That wide scope
6 nevertheless excludes laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract
7 ideas. "Such discoveries are 'manifestations of ... nature, free to all
8 men and reserved exclusively to none.'" *Id.* at 309, (quoting *Funk*
9 *Bros. Seed Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co.*, 333 U.S. 127, (1948)). See also
10 *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 185 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437
11 U.S. 584, 589 (1978). "Phenomena of nature, though just discovered,
12 mental processes, and abstract intellectual concepts are not patentable,
13 as they are the basic tools of scientific and technological work."
14 *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 67 (1972).

15 *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*, 403 F.3d 1331, 1343-44 (Fed.
16 Cir. 2005).

17 Thus, the claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical
18 application. The purpose of this requirement is to limit patent protection to
19 inventions that possess a certain level of "real world" value, as opposed to subject
20 matter that represents nothing more than an idea or concept, or is simply a starting
21 point for future investigation or research (*Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 528-
22 36); *In re Ziegler*, 992, F.2d 1197, 1200-03 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). A process that
23 consists solely of the manipulation of an abstract idea is not concrete or tangible.
24 See *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 1994). See also *Schrader*, 22
25 F.3d at 295.

26 **Obviousness**

27 A claimed invention is unpatentable if the differences between it and the
28 prior art are "such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at
29 the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art." 35
30 U.S.C. § 103(a) (2000); *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1729-30
31 (2007); *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 13-14 (1966).

1 In *Graham*, the Court held that that the obviousness analysis is bottomed on
2 several basic factual inquiries: “[1] the scope and content of the prior art are to be
3 determined; [2] differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be
4 ascertained; and [3] the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved.” 383
5 U.S. at 17. *See also KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1734. “The combination of familiar
6 elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more
7 than yield predictable results.” *Id.* at 1739.

8 “When a work is available in one field of endeavor, design incentives and
9 other market forces can prompt variations of it, either in the same field or a
10 different one. If a person of ordinary skill can implement a predictable variation, §
11 103 likely bars its patentability.” *Id.* at 1740.

12 “For the same reason, if a technique has been used to improve one device,
13 and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve
14 similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual
15 application is beyond his or her skill.” *Id.*

16 “Under the correct analysis, any need or problem known in the field of
17 endeavor at the time of invention and addressed by the patent can provide a reason
18 for combining the elements in the manner claimed.” *Id.* at 1742.

19 *Automation of a Known Process*

20 It is generally obvious to automate a known manual procedure or mechanical
21 device. Our reviewing court stated in *Leapfrog Enterprises Inc. v. Fisher-Price*
22 *Inc.*, 485 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2007) that one of ordinary skill in the art would have
23 found it obvious to combine an old electromechanical device with electronic
24 circuitry “to update it using modern electronic components in order to gain the
25 commonly understood benefits of such adaptation, such as decreased size,

1 increased reliability, simplified operation, and reduced cost. . . . The combination
2 is thus the adaptation of an old idea or invention . . . using newer technology that is
3 commonly available and understood in the art." *Id* at 1163.

4 *Obviousness and Nonfunctional Descriptive Material*

5 Nonfunctional descriptive material cannot render nonobvious an invention that
6 would have otherwise been obvious. *In re Ngai*, 367 F.3d 1336, 1339 (Fed. Cir.
7 2004). Cf. *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (when descriptive
8 material is not functionally related to the substrate, the descriptive material will not
9 distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability).

10 ANALYSIS

11 *Claims 1-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject
12 matter.*

13 The Examiner found that the claims do not require that a computer processor or
14 structure be part of the recited system because they do not define any structural and
15 functional interrelationships between the recited "case study" and other elements of
16 a computer, which permit the functionality to be realized. The Examiner
17 concluded that the claims recite non-functional descriptive material, as no
18 recitation of executable code being embodied on any medium or data structure is
19 provided (Answer 4).

20 The Appellants contend that the preamble of the claims makes it clear that the
21 claimed "system" is for "medical training," a clearly tangible result. Furthermore,
22 the Appellants argue the system is "computer-based" and it is "interactive," as the
23 detailed description and Web pages of the drawings illustrate. The system presents
24 a "computerized display" in a "virtual patient chart format." The Appellants
25 contend these are clearly tangible results. The Appellants conclude they are not

1 claiming an abstract idea in a paper patent, they are claiming a medical training
2 system with tangible results illustrated by actual computerized displays, Web
3 pages, of a constructed implementation (Br. 6-7: ¶ B).

4 We find that the Examiner has failed to set forth a *prima facie* case for
5 rejecting the claims as drawn to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner stated
6 that the claims lack structural or functional interrelationships and fail to have a
7 tangible result. The Examiner made no findings as to the nature of the claimed
8 subject matter in comparison to the four enumerated categories of statutory subject
9 matter, *viz.* machine, article of manufacture, process, or composition of matter, nor
10 did the Examiner make any findings as to which if any of the judicially recognized
11 categories of subject matter, *viz.* laws of nature, scientific principals, and abstract
12 ideas, that are excluded from patent protection that the claimed subject matter
13 might fall under. The Examiner also presented no analysis regarding how the
14 claimed subject matter would or would not fall within one of those judicially
15 recognized categories. Accordingly, the Examiner failed to support the rejection
16 with the analysis required to show that the claimed subject matter was non-
17 statutory.

18 We find that the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the
19 Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed
20 to non-statutory subject matter.

21 *Claims 1-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to
22 particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.*

23 The Examiner found that the step of claim 1 of "presented in a computerized
24 display" does not make it clear whether the computer is part of the claim or if all
25 that is claimed is the display on the screen (Answer 5). The Appellants contend

1 that the cited phrase is a limitation describing the medium in which the case study
2 is presented. The word "computerized" is an adjective modifying the noun
3 "display." We agree with the Appellants. The Appellants' syntactic analysis
4 shows that the phrase "computerized display" is not indefinite, and that contrary to
5 the Examiner's finding, the display as recited is modified by being driven by a
6 computer.

7 The Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred
8 in rejecting claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to
9 particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

10 *Claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over
11 Allison and Eckmann.*

12 The Appellants argue these claims as a group.² Accordingly, we select claim 1
13 as representative of the group. 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii) (2007).

14 The Examiner found that Allison described a computer based-interactive
15 medical training system and Eckman described a chart simulating realistic aspects
16 of a patient chart of medical records (Answer 3-4).

17 The Appellants contend that there is no suggestion of a virtual patient chart in
18 Eckman. The Appellants argue that the publication referred to by Eckmann is a
19 book that may include a case study, but that there is no suggestion of a virtual
20 patient chart (Br. 8).

² The Appellants contend that there is a single §103 rejection based on the five references, *viz.* claims 1-23 rejected on the basis of Allison, Eckmann, Gray, Ramshaw, and Garcia (Br. 7-8: ¶ D). This is incorrect. There are four rejections under §103 rejection, and none are based on the five references. Since the only claim specifically argued is claim 1, we therefore treat all claims as argued as a group based on claim 1.

1 To decide this issue, we must first construe the limitation of a patient chart.
2 The Specification defines a patient chart as a medical record file familiar to most
3 medical professionals (FF 01). That is a patient chart is a medical record file. The
4 scope or degree of familiarity does not define a chart structurally or functionally.
5 There is no evidence in the record linking such familiarity to specific structure that
6 is familiar, or, since such familiarity may change over time, the time period when
7 such familiarity was to be understood.

8 Eckman describes how, for each simulated patient management problem, the
9 publication would include a brief patient history (FF 04). Eckman's example
10 clearly presents a medical record since it describes medical symptoms, frequency,
11 and correlations, along with medical history information (FF 05). Allison
12 describes a medical training system that stores its courses. Such courses stored on
13 a computer system are files. Thus were Eckman's patient management problems
14 applied in the context of Allison's system, Eckman's example would be a virtual
15 medical record file, which is what we construed a virtual patient chart to be.

16 Since whether the combination of Eckman and Allison described or suggested
17 a virtual patient chart is the sole issue argued, we conclude that the Appellants
18 have not sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting
19 claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison
20 and Eckmann.

21 *Claim 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison, Eckmann,
22 and Gray.*

23 The Appellants have not separately argued claim 5, which therefore stands or
24 falls with claim 1, and thus have not sustained their burden of showing that the
25 Examiner erred in rejecting claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over

1 Allison, Eckmann, and Gray.

2

3 *Claim 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison, Eckmann,*
4 *and Garcia.*

5 The Appellants have not separately argued claim 8, which therefore stands or
6 falls with claim 1, and thus have not sustained their burden of showing that the
7 Examiner erred in rejecting claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over
8 Allison, Eckmann, and Garcia.

9 *Claims 13-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison,*
10 *Eckmann, and Ramshaw.*

11 The Appellants have not separately argued claims 13-23, which therefore stand
12 or fall with claim 1, and thus have not sustained their burden of showing that the
13 Examiner erred in rejecting claims 13-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable
14 over Allison, Eckmann, and Ramshaw.

15 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

16 The Appellants have not sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner
17 erred in rejecting claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the
18 prior art.

19 The Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred
20 in rejecting claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject
21 matter.

22 The Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred
23 in rejecting claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to
24 particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

DECISION

To summarize, our decision is as follows:

- The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison and Eckmann is sustained.
 - The rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison, Eckmann, and Gray is sustained.
 - The rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison, Eckmann, and Garcia is sustained.
 - The rejection of claims 13-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Allison, Eckmann, and Ramshaw is sustained.
 - The rejection of claims 1-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter is not sustained.
 - The rejection of claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention is not sustained.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv) (2007).

AFFIRMED

Appeal 2008-4996
Application 09/963,251

1
2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 LV:

10

11 PHILIPS MEDICAL SYSTEMS
12 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
13 P.O. BOX 3003
14 22100 BOTHELL EVERETT HIGHWAY
15 BOTHELL, WA 98041-3003